DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 682 CE 004 473

TITLE	The Adult Basic Education Program: Progress in Reducing Illiteracy and Improvements Needed. Report to the Congress.
INSTITUTION	Comptroller General of the U.S., Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	4 Jun 75
NOTE	43p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U. S. General Accounting Office, Distribution Section, P. O. Box 1020, Washington, D. C. 20013 (Stock No. MWD-75-61, $1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Adult Education Programs; Adult Literacy; Educational Legislation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Needs; Educational Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Federal State Relationship; Government Role; Illiteracy; Illiterate Adults; *Literacy Education; Program Administration; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	California, Illinois; North Carolina; Texas; Virginia

ABSTRACT

Adult basic education programs in California, Illinois, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia were reviewed to assess the progress made by the programs in reducing illiteracy. The programs' management was also evaluated. It was found that although some positive achievements have been made, the program successfully reaches only a small fraction of those needing it. In the program's first nine years, about 4.6 million adults enrolled, but only about one percent of the 57 million adults in the target population and four percent or the 15 million adults with less than eight years of schooling have participated in any given year. Through fiscal year 1972, 17 percent of the 3.5 million participants at or below the eighth grade level had achieved an eighth grade equivalency education. Management problems include: lack of realistic and measurable program goals and evaluative criteria, misdirected recruiting, limited benefits of special projects and unsystematic dissemination of their results, lack of coordination with Federal antipoverty and manpower-training programs, and inaccurate reporting of data. The report recommends several actions (including legislative and congressional) for combating these problems. (Author/PR)

ED110682

C E

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Adult Basic Education Program: Progress In Reducing Illiteracy And Improvements Needed

Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

CE004473

MWD-75-61

JUNE 4, 1975

JUN 25 1975

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-164031(1)

To the President of the Senate and
the Speaker of the House of Representatives

This is our report on the adult basic education program's progress in reducing illiteracy and improvements needed. The program is authorized by the Adult Education Act of 1966, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1201), and is administered by the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We made our review pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Comptroller General
of the United States

Contents

		Page
DIGEST		i
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	PROGRAM PROGRESS	4
	Program availability	4
	Program impact	4
	Conclusions	7
3	PROBLEMS IN PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8
	Measurable program goals	9
	Program priorities	9
	Allocation of funds	12
	Special projects and teacher training	13
	Cooperation with other programs	16
	Program monitoring	18
	Program statistics	19
	Identifying the target population	20
	Conclusions	21
	Recommendations to HEW	21
	Agency comments	23
	Recommendations to the Congress	24
4	IDENTIFYING EFFECTIVE WAYS OF PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL SERVICES	26
	Individual needs and goals	27
	Conclusions	28
	Recommendation to HEW	29
	Agency Comments	29
5	SCOPE OF REVIEW	30

Page

APPENDIX

I Letter dated March 25, 1975, from the Assistant Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 31

II Principal officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsible for the activities discussed in this report 36

ABBREVIATIONS

GAO	General Accounting Office
HEW	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
OE	Office of Education

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

THE ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM: PROGRESS IN REDUCING ILLITERACY AND IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

The adult basic education program is designed to reach and educate adults, not in school, whose inability to speak, read, or write English impairs their ability to obtain or retain employment or to meet their responsibilities as adults. (See p. 1.)

GAO was concerned with whether the program was making progress in reducing illiteracy and with its management. (See p. 29.)

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Program progress

Although the Adult Education program has made positive achievements, it successfully reaches only a small fraction of those needing it--particularly among the more educationally deficient. In the Adult Education program's first 9 years, about 4.6 million adults enrolled. Only about 1 percent of the 57 million adults in the Adult Education target population and 4 percent of the 15 million adults with less than 8 years of school have participated in any given year.

Through fiscal year 1972, 594,000, or 17 percent, of the 3.5 million participants at or below the eighth grade level had achieved an eighth grade equivalency education--the level at which a person is considered literate according to the Office of Education.

The Adult Education program provides instruction through the 8th grade (adult basic education) and the 9th through 12th grades (adult secondary education). (See pp. 1, 4, 5, and 7.)

Funding and administration

During fiscal years 1965-73 Federal grants to States totaled $308 million; State and local agencies spent $105 million more. Another $59 million in Federal funds went for special projects and teacher-training grants. Federal cost for each Adult Education enrollee fell from $83 to $59 from fiscal years 1965 to 1973. (See pp. 5 and 13.)

Program problems

Program management problems include:

--The Office of Education has not established or directed States to establish realistic and measurable Adult Education program goals or given States definitive criteria to evaluate the program. (See pp. 8 and 9.)

--Recruiting adults in the first priority group--those functioning at the fourth grade level or below--has not been emphasized. (See p. 9.)

Tear Sheet. Upon removal, the report cover date should be noted hereon.

--Special projects have had limited benefits and project results have not been systematically disseminated. (See p. 13.)

--The Office of Education has not insured that States coordinate Adult Education programs with Federal antipoverty and manpower-training programs. (See p. 16.)

--Data reported by States and localities has been inaccurate and has tended to overstate program accomplishments. (See p. 19.)

Also certain areas require legislative revision:

--Although many adults with high school diplomas are functioning below the eighth grade level, the Adult Education Act excludes people who have high school diplomas or their equivalent from the program. (See p. 12.)

--The act's allotment formula does not give special emphasis to instruction below the secondary level, although the act provides that such emphasis be given. Therefore, the formula does not recognize the higher priority and higher costs of reaching adults at the lower grade levels. (See p. 12.)

RECOMMENDATIONS AND AGENCY ACTIONS

GAO recommends steps the Office of Education should take to correct these and other program management problems. HEW agreed with these recommendations. (See pp. 21 and 28.)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

GAO suggested that the Congress consider amending the Adult Education Act to:

--Allow adults with high school diplomas to participate in the adult basic education program, if they are functioning below that level.

--Revise the allotment formula to recognize the higher priority and higher costs of reaching adults with less than 8 years of school.

If the Congress believes the program should better meet its objectives, additional funding will likely be required. (See p. 24.)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1201) of 1966 provides Federal assistance to expand educational opportunities and to encourage the establishment of adult public education programs. The act authorizes Federal grants for Adult Education programs that will enable all people 16 years of age or older to continue their education through secondary school. The act (section 306(a)) places special emphasis on "adult basic education" defined as education for adults whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language greatly impairs their ability to get or retain jobs commensurate with their real ability. It is designed to eliminate these inabilities and raise the individuals' levels of education to (1) make them less likely to become dependent on others, (2) improve their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increase their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and (3) make them better able to meet their adult responsibilities. The Office of Education (OE), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), further defines "adult basic education" as education through the eighth grade level.

Federal assistance for adult basic education began with enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2781). The Adult Education Act transferred authority for the Adult Education program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to OE. (In 1968 the act was amended to change the definition of an adult from a person who is 18 to one who is 16 years of age or older.)

The Adult Education Act authorizes OE to make grants for Adult Education to States that have State plans approved by the Commissioner of Education. Funds received through the grant system may not exceed 90 percent of the total program cost. Local education agencies, which receive Federal funds through State agencies, carry out most programs.

OE is responsible for administering the program and for developing regulations and guidelines on the program's

operations, funding, and evaluation. It has delegated its responsibilities for program operations to the HEW regional offices. OE program officers at the regional offices are responsible for reviewing State plans, monitoring State programs, and providing State officials with technical assistance.

Each State is required to submit a State plan and to prepare an annual program plan which sets forth the policy, procedures, criteria, and priorities to be followed by the State agency in approving local Adult Education programs. Such plans must insure that substantial progress will be made in establishing or expanding Adult Education programs for all segments of the adult population in all areas of the State.

Local educational agencies wishing to participate in the Adult Education program apply to the State for funds. According to HEW regulations, before an application is approved, the State must determine that the proposed program will (1) use qualified personnel and adequate facilities, equipment, materials, guidance, and counseling services, (2) provide for effective recruitment and retention of adults in the program, and (3) provide for effective administration and supervision to insure efficient and economical operations.

At the time of our review, the Adult Education Act also authorized OE to make discretionary grants for special projects and teacher training. The Education Amendments of 1974, enacted in August 1974, shifted this responsibility to the States, which are now required to spend at least 15 percent of their allotted funds for special-project or teacher-training grants. These grants are intended to promote effective programs, practices, and approaches throughout the Nation.

The act provides for a National Advisory Council on Adult Education to advise the OE Commissioner on preparing general regulations and making policies concerning the act's administration. The Council is also required to review the administration and effectiveness of programs under the act. However, the Council's Executive Director said such reviews had been thwarted by the lack of available information on

the target group, which he felt was necessary to assess program effectiveness. The Council has identified the Adult Education program's target group as the 57 million adults, 16 years of age or older and not enrolled in school, who have not completed their secondary education.

CHAPTER 2

PROGRAM PROGRESS

Since it began in 1965, the adult basic education program has expanded educational opportunities by establishing programs for adults who want to continue their formal education. OE statistics, however, show that the program has had little impact on reducing illiteracy among adults. And these statistics overstated program accomplishments. In addition, the program has had some beneficial side effects--participants registered to vote for the first time and obtained U.S. citizenship.

PROGRAM AVAILABILITY

Before the Federal program began in 1965, only eight States operated any significant adult basic education programs. OE statistics show that, during fiscal year 1965, 19 States and 37,991 students participated in the Federal program. Two years later, all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and five territories conducted adult basic education classes. In fiscal year 1972, more than 820,000 adults attended the Adult Education program's 44,560 evening and 14,713 daytime classes. By 1973 enrollment had risen to nearly 850,000, and OE expected enrollment to reach 1 million in 1974.

Program officials in four of the five States we visited estimated that classes were within commuting distance of 90 percent of their States' populations. The program director in the other State said classes were readily available to 75 percent of the population. It appeared from available data that classes were within commuting distance of a great majority of the population.

PROGRAM IMPACT

OE statistics show that, in the Adult Education program's first 9 years, about 4.6 million adults were enrolled. Through fiscal year 1972, 94 percent of the enrollees were receiving adult basic education. Only about 1 percent of the Adult Education program's estimated target population of 57 million adults and 4 percent of the 15 million adults

with less than 8 years of school have participated in any given year.

Only 17 percent of the program's 3.5 million enrollees at or below the eighth grade level achieved an eighth grade equivalency education in fiscal years 1965-72--the only years for which completion data was available. The table below summarizes available OE funding, enrollment, and completion data for fiscal years 1965-73.

FY	Expenditures			Total Adult Education enrollment (note a)	Adult basic education enrollment	Eighth grade completions
	Federal	Non-Federal	Total			
	(000 omitted)					
1965	$ 3,147	$ 4,797	$ 7,944	37,991	37,991	-
1966	32,561	9,919	42,480	377,660	377,660	36,056
1967	25,430	8,348	33,778	388,935	388,935	45,332
1968	30,584	8,692	39,276	455,730	455,730	54,087
1969	35,991	11,686	47,679	484,626	484,626	85,659
1970	[b]37,992	9,869	47,861	535,613	535,613	92,293
1971	42,306	14,515	56,821	620,922	620,922	101,767
1972	49,693	17,371	67,064	820,514	594,127	178,767
1973	50,423	20,092	70,515	849,529	(c)	(c)
Total	$308,129	$105,289	$413,418	4,571,520	3,495,604	593,961

[a] Before fiscal year 1972, OE reported no enrollees at the secondary level. However, HEW regulations now provide that, in certain cases, up to 20 percent of Adult Education funds can be used for secondary programs.
[b] Figure partially estimated by OE.
[c] Not available.

The Adult Education Act requires non-Federal matching funds of at least 10 percent for State participation in the program. From fiscal years 1965-73 matching funds reported to OE have equaled $105 million, or 25 percent of the total expenditure. For fiscal year 1973, the matching funds were 28.4 percent of the total expenditure. Although total annual matching funds consistently exceeded the Federal requirement, the percentage of State and local funds did not continually increase over the first 9 program years.

Using data in the above table, we found the average annual cost for each enrollee in the Adult Education program during fiscal years 1968-72 was about $90. The average cost for each adult basic education participant completing an eighth

grade equivalency during the same period was about $470. The Federal cost for each Adult Education enrollee fell from $83 in fiscal year 1965 to $59 in fiscal year 1973.

The enrollment and completion data in the above table is based on statistics prepared at the local program level and submitted to State departments of education. These statistics are summarized by each State and then submitted to OE in the States' annual program reports. The data is inaccurate; this problem is discussed in chapter 3.

Other program impacts

Adult Education program participants obtained other educational and personal benefits. For example, each year many students were reported to have graduated from high school, registered to vote for the first time, gained U.S. citizenship, or obtained training in preparing their income tax forms.

A 1973 OE-funded national study of the adult basic education program showed that many participants gained employment, increased their earnings, and raised their educational levels. For example, during a 4-month period:

--26 percent of the enrollees gained a grade or more in reading, and 19 percent gained a grade or more in mathematics.

--The average gain was one-half grade in reading and three-tenths of a grade in mathematics.

--7 percent of the enrollees gained two or more grades in reading, and 4 percent gained two or more grades in mathematics.

However, the study showed that, during the same period, about one-third of all enrollees made no gain or even regressed. Also, over a 6-month period, more than 60 percent of the enrollees left the program.

Separations from the program

Although many participants left the Adult Education program before completing the school year or attaining an eighth grade equivalency education, OE reports indicate that many did so for essentially positive reasons: they obtained employment or took better jobs; entered other training; or met their personal objectives, such as the ability to read material of special importance in their jobs.

Many others dropped out because of a lack of interest or personal problems, such as poor health, lack of transportation or child care facilities, and conflicts with class schedules. However, the reasons for the largest number of separations in OE's most recent annual report were unknown.

CONCLUSIONS

Since it began in 1965, the adult basic education program has expanded educational opportunities by establishing broadly available programs for those adults who want to continue their formal education through completion of the eighth grade and in some cases through high school. Although the Adult Education program has had positive achievements, as currently funded and operated it is successfully reaching only a small fraction of those needing it--particulary among the more educationally deficient.

CHAPTER 3

PROBLEMS IN PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

OE does not know whether it is making adequate progress in reducing adult illiteracy because it has not established realistic and measurable goals. Also OE has not provided States with definitive criteria for evaluating the program.

The management of the Adult Education program could be improved and the program would be more effective if:

--HEW regulations emphasized recruiting in relation to program priorities, because, as stated in chapter 2, the program is reaching only a small fraction of those needing it. Limited numbers of adults have been recruited in the highest priority group of the target population.

--The States allocated program funds giving special emphasis to the first priority group. However, the allotment formula in the legislation is not consistent with the act's provision that special emphasis be given to adult basic education. Thus, in addition to fund allocation being a management problem, in our opinion, it will also require legislative revision.

--Special projects yielded more than the limited benefits that have been provided so far.

--OE took steps to insure that States coordinate Adult Education programs with Federal antipoverty and manpower-training programs, as required under the Adult Education Act.

--OE adequately monitored the State grant program.

--OE improved its program reporting data.

In addition, neither OE nor the States have completely identified the target population.

MEASURABLE PROGRAM GOALS

HEW's Operational Planning System requires agency program managers to (1) develop clear, measurable objectives indicating what each program intends to accomplish in terms of output or impact and (2) set milestones to measure effectiveness. OE, however, has neither established measurable goals or objectives for the Adult Education program nor required State education agencies to establish them.

The only OE effort toward setting program goals is contained in its 5-year plan. The plan was prepared in 1973 for internal planning purposes--to influence OE policy and funding. The goal stated in this document, although never officially established as an OE goal or communicated to the States, is to eliminate illiteracy within 6 to 10 years. However, according to Federal, State, and local officials we talked to, this goal is unrealistic in terms of the present funding. The goal is also based on invalid assumptions. For example, OE assumed that each enrollee would actively participate for 2 years before reaching the eighth grade level. The average enrollee, however, participates for 1 year or less, progresses about one grade level each year of participation, and does not attain an eighth grade level.

PROGRAM PRIORITIES

HEW Adult Education program regulations require that State programs give first priority to programs providing instruction for adults functioning at the 4th grade level or below, second priority to programs for adults functioning from the 4th through 8th grade levels, and third priority to programs for adults functioning at the 9th through 12th grade levels. The regulations specify that under no circumstances may more than 20 percent of a State's allotment be spent for secondary-level instruction. However, the regulations do not emphasize recruiting participants in relation to the program's priorities, even though, as chapter 2 points out, the program is reaching only a small fraction of those needing it. OE statistics show that, during fiscal year 1972, less than one-third of the enrollees were in the first priority group.

State and local program officials generally acknowledged that they were not emphasizing the recruitment of adults in the first priority group. Their reasons for not doing so included (1) the difficulty in determining potential applicants' functioning grade levels and (2) the impracticability of recruiting adults in the first priority group, except those primarily in need of learning English as a second language, because they lacked motivation and were least interested in the program.

Concerning the first reason, program officials pointed out, for example, that it was difficult to determine whether an adult functioned at the fourth of fifth grade level and therefore whether he was in the first or second priority group. The officials emphasized that this task was even more difficult without pretesting, which they generally discouraged because they believed it was a psychological barrier to new students.

An OE-funded national study reported that little evidence could be found that adult basic education programs were established or that students were recruited in such a way as to deliberately seek out unusually hard-to-reach adults, such as those in the first priority group.

State and local program officials pointed out that recruiting people functioning below the fourth grade level was much more costly than recruiting people functioning at higher grade levels. Thus, extensive recruitment at the lower levels could limit the total number of participants. They generally disagreed with OE's policy of giving first priority to those people least interested in the program. In their opinion, the program would be improved by merely making services equally available to all eligible people who want them.

OE and State program officials told us that, to reach people in the first priority group, a door-to-door recruiting program would be necessary but that such a program would be more costly than the less personalized approaches currently used and would require more planning and closer administration.

Secondary-level enrollments

HEW regulations--and since 1974 the act--restrict the percentage of State grant funds that may be spent for secondary-level instruction to a maximum of 20 percent. OE, however, does not require State education agencies to record or report expenditures by grade levels. Consequently, OE does not have the information to enforce compliance with the expenditure limitation. The Director of OE's Division of Adult Education concurred and said the States would be required to submit this information.

Although expenditure and enrollment data may not equate, 62 percent of the reported fiscal year 1973 enrollment in one State was at the secondary level. Similarly, OE enrollment data for fiscal year 1972 showed that 31 States had secondary-level enrollments over 20 percent.

Reporting on non-English-speaking enrollees

The learning needs of non-English-speaking enrollees are different from those of English-speaking enrollees. The level of motivation of non-English-speaking enrollees is generally considered much higher than that of English-speaking enrollees. In addition, the curriculum and teaching approaches used for non-English-speaking students generally differ from those of English-speaking enrollees.

The Education Amendments of 1974, require that special assistance be given to people with limited English-speaking ability. OE, however, does not distinguish between non-English-speaking and English-speaking enrollees in the statistics collected from State and local programs. OE estimated that non-English-speaking participants made up almost one-third of the adult basic education enrollment in fiscal years 1972 and 1973. To assess compliance with the new legislation, OE will need separate reporting on non-English-speaking students.

Participation by needy students prevented

The act excludes people with high school diplomas or their equivalent from participation in the Adult Education program. But an OE-funded study of the adult basic education program during 1971-73 showed that, of the 2,300 enrollees under age 45 investigated, about 345, or 15 percent, were high school graduates and a few had attended college.

The study also showed a great need for adult basic education among these participants, in spite of their ineligible status. On tests administered as part of this study, 29 percent of the 345 participants read below the fifth grade level, over two-thirds read below the seventh grade level, and almost half functioned below the seventh grade level in mathematics.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

The Adult Education Act requires that special emphasis be given to adult basic education--generally considered to be instruction at or below the eighth grade level. HEW regulations require that first priority be given to programs providing instruction below the fourth grade level and second priority to programs providing instruction at the fifth to eighth grade levels. However, the formula in the act for allotting funds among the States gives no priority to instruction below the secondary level. Each State receives a basic grant of $150,000, plus a percentage of the remaining funds based on its population with less than a secondary-level education. An OE 1972 internal report noted this contradiction and recommended that the formula be revised to distribute funds on the basis of people with less than an eighth grade education. Because of OE's problems with other aspects of the report, this recommendation has not been implemented.

None of the States visited based their allocation of funds to local projects on the population or enrollment of high-priority people. Instead, they allocated funds to local projects primarily on the basis of previous years' funding levels and on a first-come-first-served basis.

In our opinion, an inconsistency exists between (1) the act's allotment formula which requires that funds be allotted on the basis of adults with less than a secondary-level education and (2) the act's provision that special emphasis be given to adult basic education--which OE interprets to mean instruction at or below the eighth grade level. Therefore, the formula has not fully recognized the higher priority and higher costs of reaching adults functioning at the lower grade levels. We believe congressional action to revise the allotment formula is the best way to resolve this inconsistency. The Director of OE's Division of Adult Education agreed with us and believes that OE should recommend such a change in the legislation.

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND TEACHER TRAINING

At the time of our review, the Adult Education Act required that OE spend between 10 and 20 percent of Adult Education funds on discretionary grants for special projects and teacher training. The Education Amendments of 1974 shifted this responsibility to the States and changed the percentage to 15 percent of the funds allocated to the States. This shift in responsibility increases the need for OE and State coordination in eliminating unnecessary duplication among the States in awarding and carrying out their special-project and teacher-training grants. The amendments also required OE to establish an Adult Education clearinghouse to collect and disseminate Adult Education information.

Through fiscal year 1973, $42 million in Federal funds were appropriated for special projects and $17 million for teacher training, totaling $59 million.

Special projects

The act provides for two types of special projects.

1. Those that involve innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs that may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs.

2. Those that involve Adult Education programs carried out in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local programs which have unusual promise of promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of people with educational deficiencies.

According to the Director of OE's Division of Adult Education, OE interprets the act to mean that only the first type of project is expected to produce results which benefit the program nationally. The second type is expected to benefit only the specific project being funded.

In fiscal years 1967-73, OE awarded 267 special-project grants. The Director said about two-thirds of these grants were awarded to projects of the second type, even though, in his opinion, the first type is a better investment because more people may benefit. Among the reasons cited by the Director for the lack of emphasis on the first type of project were:

--The newness and low level of sophistication of the special-project effort, which contrasts with the more sophisticated research often needed for projects of the first type.

--Various national priorities involving the second type of project which were seen as more immediate needs, such as programs for model cities, migrants, and Indians.

--An OE policy which, until 2 years ago, prohibited commitments to grants of more than 1 year and which therefore tended to inhibit the more sophisticated researchers from participating.[1]

---

[1]Although grantees have often been funded for more than 1 year in this program, until 2 years ago all grantees were required to compete annually for funds.

State and local officials said special projects, as a whole, had been of little benefit to the Adult Education program. Many of the officials indicated these grants had been awarded to projects having no direct application to the program. They also pointed out that many project results either had not been disseminated or had not demonstrated how they might improve the program. State officials complained that OE special projects were funded and operated without being coordinated through the State departments of education. These problems should diminish now that the States have assumed responsibility for administering the special projects.

None of the State or local officials interviewed offered evidence that special projects had contributed measurably to increased enrollment or student achievement. Also, a 1973 OE-funded national study found that the use of innovations developed by special projects could not be confirmed in the 90 local programs and 200 classes investigated.

An OE official said the problem with special projects was identifying project results and getting them adopted, not the nature or quality of work involved. Also OE has not been able to maintain close contact with its special projects because of staff and travel fund limitations. He said a good management information system could systematically identify useful results by establishing a format for cross-referencing various projects, products, and practices. The official also said, that, although disseminating results had not been systematic, the more expensive process of adopting them was a larger problem. He estimated that, for every dollar spent on special projects, about $10 would be required to get the results adopted nationally. We did not evaluate the reasonableness of this estimate.

Teacher-training projects

According to an OE official, over 23,000 teachers, administrators, and other people received training during fiscal year 1974 as part of an overall staff development effort. Each of the five States visited had a staff development project coordinated with the Adult Education program, and some States had set minimum attendance requirements on instructional staff for the training sessions.

State and local officials told us they were satisfied with staff development projects and generally considered the materials developed under the grants to be more worthwhile or successful than those of special projects. In addition, an OE official told us that staff development projects had provided State programs with such forms of technical assistance as program planning and evaluation, in-service training, identification of training materials and systems, dissemination of special-project results and materials, development of data collection systems, and needs assessment.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

The Adult Education Act requires that each State submit a plan that will "provide for cooperation with Community Action programs, Work Experience programs, VISTA [Volunteers in Service to America], Work Study, and other programs relating to the antipoverty effort." The Education Amendments of 1974 changed the act to also provide for cooperation with manpower-training, occupational education, and adult reading-improvement programs. HEW regulations also require that, when approving project applications, State agencies consider the extent to which local programs will cooperate with programs related to the antipoverty effort.

In addition, OE guidelines state that experience has shown the Adult Education program's success is related to the degree that it coordinates with other community resources to provide maximum services for the target group.

Cooperation between the Adult Education and Federal antipoverty programs could be improved at both the State and local levels. Four of the five State plans reviewed provided for cooperation with State health authorities, but they did not indicate the nature or extent of cooperation with antipoverty programs. The plans quoted or paraphrased the requirement cited in the act without indicating how or to what extent interprogram cooperation might be achieved. In practice, the State educational agencies generally relied on the local programs to develop cooperative arrangements. However, such arrangements at the local level were infrequent. There was no evidence of widespread and systematic cooperation in such areas as

recruitment, staff development, and curriculum design, all of which could benefit the target groups. For example, if adult basic education programs made cooperative arrangements with State employment agencies, potential students could be referred to the program.

There has also been limited coordination between the adult basic education program and other programs providing occupational and basic literacy training for the disadvantaged, such as programs authorized by the former Manpower Development and Training Act. For example, a 1973 OE-funded study of basic education provided under that act reported that "little more than lip service is paid to linking these two programs and the idea of establishing mutually reinforcing goals has not been seriously considered, except in rare instances at the State and local levels * * *." The study reported little cooperation in staff development between the programs. Some manpower-training basic education staff had, however, attended inservice training conducted by the adult basic education program, which generally appeared to be more favorably regarded than that provided for basic education instructors by the Manpower Development and Training Act's staff training agency. The study also stated that most manpower-training instructors were not aware of the adult basic education inservice training, although a number of them indicated that they would be interested in attending.

An internal OE evaluation made in 1972 also concluded that there was a lack of cooperation and coordination among Federal Adult Education programs, even among OE programs, and that consolidation was needed at both the Federal and the State levels. In addition, some State officials said the Federal Government had been unable or unwilling to coordinate its programs and had therefore shifted this responsibility to the States. In response to our inquiry, OE officials could not cite any benefits resulting from interprogram cooperation at the national level, although they identified several areas of potential benefit from present cooperative efforts.

An example of such cooperation, which OE officials believe could have a great impact on reducing illiteracy, is a contract jointly funded by OE's Right to Read Program and the Division of Adult Education. The OE contractor is

developing two television series to help adults functioning at or below the fourth grade level to improve their reading. One series will be directed toward English speakers, and the other, in Spanish, will concentrate on Spanish speakers. Each will consist of 25 half hour programs with printed materials that support the lessons. Programs will be available on videotape for public and commercial television stations and on cassettes for classrooms or community centers.

State Adult Education programs have been coordinated more with other State and local service organizations than with antipoverty programs. There were numerous instances of reciprocal services offered by Adult Education programs and other organizations. For example, at several of the sites visited, the adult basic education program provided literacy training for the clientele of welfare or rehabilitative agencies, and Adult Education participants received free child care, transportation, or other services from these agencies.

Both the adult basic education and the antipoverty programs, as well as other State and local programs, are designed to serve essentially the same population--the disadvantaged. Cooperation among the programs can (1) eliminate unnecessary duplication in such areas as recruitment and staff development and (2) improve opportunities for the target population to obtain the full range of services available.

PROGRAM MONITORING

OE has delegated to its regional offices the responsibility for reviewing State plans and monitoring State programs.

Each HEW region has only one program officer for Adult Education. Visits by regional program officers to State and local programs have been short and infrequent. For example, in one region, the program officer spends about 1 week a year visiting local programs in each of the States in his region. In other regions, visits by program officers were even less frequent. Aside from these visits, OE's monitoring has been essentially limited to telephone contacts and reviews of annual reports.

An internal OE report prepared in 1972 concluded that OE's program monitoring of the State programs had been inadequate, partly due to the lack of direction provided to the regional offices. Statements made to us by 8 of the 10 regional program officers supported this conclusion. HEW regulations for the Adult Education program, are not specific enough to serve as standards for evaluating State performance in terms of either compliance or effectiveness. For example, the regulations state that recruitment and retention of participants, as well as program administration and supervision, are to be effective but do not state what constitutes effectiveness. Moreover, OE has not provided supplementary directions or guidelines to assist regional program officers in monitoring or evaluating State and local program performance.

In addition to not providing guidance, OE headquarters officials attributed their weak monitoring to shortages of travel funds and insufficient numbers of well-trained and aggressive field representatives. We believe that, had OE officials more closely monitored the program in the past, they would have been aware of, and might have corrected, the types of problems discussed in this chapter.

PROGRAM STATISTICS

The statistics compiled at the local program level, and ultimately reported to OE and summarized nationally, have been unreliable and have overstated program accomplishments. For example:

--In three of the five States visited, there were instances of duplicate enrollment reporting. One State, which had a 43-percent decrease in enrollment, attributed part of the loss to a change in reporting which eliminated duplication.

--In one State, 25 percent of the local programs reported only total enrollment; the State estimated the remaining statistics for these programs. In addition, local programs in at least one other State recorded only enrollment data.

--Local programs in at least three States overstated the number of adults who had obtained eighth grade equivalency.

Program officials at the Federal, State, and local levels said reported statistics were often inaccurate and unreliable. An HEW audit in one of the States visited also disclosed inaccuracies in reporting.

In addition, OE annual Adult Education program reports were not promptly issued. For example, OE's fiscal year 1973 program report was still not available in January 1975.

IDENTIFYING THE TARGET POPULATION

To know the dimensions of the problem the program is addressing, it is necessary to identify the target population. An accurate assessment of the target population can give management (1) the basic information to obtain and allocate needed resources and (2) a standard for measuring program progress and effectiveness.

OE has relied almost exclusively on census data showing the number of years of formal school completed in identifying the program's target population. Using census data, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education identified the Adult Education program's target population as the 57 million adults, 16 years of age or older and not enrolled in school, who have completed less than 12 years of formal school. An OE education statistics specialist told us that each year about 1 million students drop out of school before completing high school, and OE projections indicate that figure will continue through 1982. March 1973 census data also indicates that about 15 million adults have completed less than 8 years of school.

The census figures may not be a good indication of the size of the actual target population. According to the Director of OE's Division of Adult Education, grades completed do not accurately measure a person's functional level because for many people actual functional levels are below the number of grades completed. Although functional grade-level data on the general population is not available, an OE-funded national study indicated that, although the average adult basic education program participant had completed over nine grades of formal school, his actual functional level was only at the fifth grade level in reading and the sixth grade level in mathematics.

Through a special project, OE is attempting to better define "functional literacy," to provide a more reliable basis for identifying the adult basic education target group. The project, which is scheduled for completion in December 1975, is trying to describe adult functional literacy in practical terms that relate to adult performance in society rather than simply grade-level or academic terms and to develop techniques for assessing adult functional literacy.

On the basis of survey samples administered under this project:

--An estimated 86 million adults cannot compute the gasoline consumption rate of a car when given the necessary data.

--An estimated 52 million adults cannot correctly match personal qualifications to job requirements in classified advertisements.

--A projected 48 million adults cannot determine the correct amount of change from a purchase when given a cash register receipt and the denomination of the bill used to pay for the purchase.

--A projected 39 million adults cannot interpret an earnings statement well enough to find the deduction for social security.

CONCLUSIONS

The program's operation could be more successful in reducing adult illiteracy if certain aspects of its management were improved.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO HEW

We recommend that the Secretary of HEW direct OE to:

--Establish clear, measurable objectives for the Adult Education program, in terms of output or impact, and periodic milestones to measure the program's effectiveness in accomplishing these objectives, as required by HEW's Operational Planning System. OE

should also require that State education agencies establish and measure similar objectives.

--Develop guidelines to help its regional program officers monitor and evaluate State program performance and give States specific criteria for evaluating their programs. Specifically, OE should require the States to (1) emphasize recruiting and educating participants from the first priority group (2) report program expenditures by the three priority groups so that OE can determine whether the States comply with the 20-percent secondary-level instruction limitation, and (3) monitor local Adult Education programs in accordance with OE established guidelines to insure that they are being carried out in compliance with laws and regulations and are accomplishing program objectives.

--Develop a system to identify potential benefits of special projects and to insure maximum dissemination to, and adoption of, their results by State and local management levels as a part of OE's authority to establish an adult education clearinghouse.

--Develop, in consultation with the States, a method for enhancing coordination to eliminate unnecessary duplication among the States in carrying out special projects and teacher training.

--Enforce the present requirement on State and local programs to coordinate Adult Education programs with other antipoverty and manpower-training programs, as required by the Adult Education Act, by monitoring State and local programs to insure that such coordination is effective in providing optimum services.

--Institute procedures to improve the accuracy and timeliness of program statistics and establish separate reporting on enrollments and completions for non-English-speaking enrollees.

AGENCY COMMENTS

In a March 25, 1975, letter, HEW gave us its comments on matters discussed in this report. (See app. I). HEW agreed with our recommendations and described actions planned to implement them, as follows:

--Including in its fiscal year 1976 Operational Planning System measurable objectives which describe the Adult Education program's intended accomplishments and, using the State plan mechanism, requiring the States to establish similar objectives for their programs.

--Including in its Operational Planning System periodic milestones to measure the outputs and impact of the Adult Education program.

--Emphasizing the identification, recruitment, and education of priority groups; requiring expenditures to be reported in a form to allow assessment of whether this emphasis is being implemented and whether the 20-percent secondary-level limitation is being observed; and monitoring and providing technical assistance to programs.

--Establishing a system to identify potential benefits, insure dissemination, and foster adoption of special project results.

--Identifying areas of unnecessary duplication among the States in carrying out special projects and teacher-training efforts by analyzing State plans, amending HEW regulations to request descriptions of projects which States intend to fund, providing technical assistance, and publishing annual synopses of projects funded.

--In its final regulations, requiring States to include in their annual plans clear and precise procedures, policies, and mechanisms by which they will insure the coordination of all programs

stipulated in the legislation. Also, OE will, on a sample basis, develop and implement a strategy to determine whether States are complying with the coordination requirement.

--Identifying those factors which appear to contribute to problems in accuracy and timeliness in reporting, subsequently developing a program to improve the reporting system, and providing technical assistance to the States to help insure that new strategies to correct inaccuracy and timeliness problems will be implemented.

--Seeking approval from the Office of Management and Budget to collect data on enrollments and completions for non-English-speaking enrollees.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CONGRESS

The Congress should consider amending the Adult Education Act to:

--Eliminate the restriction that adults with high school diplomas be prohibited from participating in the adult basic education program if they are functioning below that level. Specifically, section 303(b) of the act could be amended to read as follows:

> (b) The term "adult education" means services or instruction below the college level (as determined by the Commissioner), for adults not currently required to be enrolled in schools who--
>
> (1) do not have a certificate of graduation from schools providing secondary education and who have not achieved an equivalent level of education or
>
> (2) have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education but need adult basic education.

--Revise the formula for allotting funds to States to recognize the higher priority and higher costs of reaching adults functioning at the lower grade levels. Part of the funds should be allotted on the basis of the number of adults with less than 8 years of school. Also States should be required to allocate funds to local programs on the basis of this principal.

The changes in program operation and administration recommended in our report should make the program more effective. Also, better approaches for reaching and teaching the target group could be developed to enhance the program's impact, particularly if special project funds are used more effectively. However, the effect of these changes on the target population may be only marginal when considered in relation to achievement of the program's purpose. If the Congress determines that the program should better meet its objectives, additional funding will likely be required. Alternatives for achieving increased funding include (1) increasing congressional appropriations and (2) requiring that non-Federal funds match Federal funds on a one-for-one or other basis.

CHAPTER 4

IDENTIFYING EFFECTIVE WAYS OF PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

People needing adult basic education often have motivational and learning deficiencies. To address these deficiencies, the systems used to provide program services must be adapted to the characteristics of various participating groups. Neither OE nor the States, however, have inventoried or made comparative evaluations of the full range of available instructional approaches and systems for teaching participants in various environments and circumstances. Instructors generally identify students' educational goals and consider them in choosing instructional methods and materials but do not normally assess individuals' learning deficiencies and suggest corrective actions.

Considering the differences in educational systems, resources, and populations among States and localities, probably no one system or approach would be ideal for reaching and teaching all the target group. The Adult Education Act and Federal regulations refrain from requiring that all States use a particular system or approach; they merely state the minimum factors the States should consider when approving local Adult Education programs. In view of the limited funding available compared with the potential target population, we believe each State and local program should use the most effective instructional methods available. Limited information on the advantages and disadvantages of the various methods in use is available to help local program officials determine which delivery systems and instructional approaches are best for their programs.

Limited studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of certain approaches to adult basic education in specific geographical areas with certain types of adults. The results of such studies would help State and local officials to tailor programs to their target groups, but OE has not systematically disseminated the results of those studies.

As an example of the information available, the Appalachian Adult Education Center has demonstrated that:

--Home instruction by paraprofessionals is more effective than traditional classrooms and learning centers--places using individualized instruction and programed materials. Students receiving home instruction showed a learning gain which was 2.5 times higher for each hour than that of students receiving classroom instruction. The learning gain of students taught in learning centers was 1.5 times higher for each hour than that of students taught in classrooms. Also the hourly cost for home instruction was $1.43, compared with $1.50 for learning centers.

--Mobile learning centers using traveling minilab learning materials are effective in rural isolated areas where a lack of transportation and similar constraints prohibit participation in a central location.

--Job placement specialists and better systems of recruitment in adult basic education are needed.

--Trained paraprofessionals are effective for recruiting and retaining participants. Students who complete high school equivalency can be used successfully as home teachers.

--Those recruiters who are more actively involved in the program, particularly teachers and students, are more successful in recruitment and retention than those who are not.

--Guidance counselors and volunteer recruiters can be very successful in recruiting and retaining adult basic education students.

INDIVIDUAL NEEDS AND GOALS

OE officials from the Adult Education and Right to Read programs believe that it is important for adult instruction

to be based on the goals of individual participants, to effectively address their motivational and learning problems. Typically, the instructors interview new students to determine what they hope to achieve from the program. When feasible, the instructors also attempt to use materials, such as trade manuals, which are related to the students' goals.

Although individual goals are often considered, the program has done little to diagnose individuals' specific learning problems or to prescribe corrective treatments. Local program officials told us that diagnostic techniques were not used to detect learning or perceptual problems. State and local officials generally said individuals' learning problems were not emphasized because:

--Funds are insufficient to provide comprehensive diagnosis and counseling.

--Most of the program's instructors are employed only part-time and have neither the time nor the training to provide such specialized services.

--The program is a minor part of the wide-ranging services offered by most of the local educational agencies and consequently receives only minor attention.

OE officials told us that the diagnostic and prescriptive approach can be used effectively at any level, including adult instruction, although the approach is not generally used in the program because diagnostic devices for adults, such as tests, are now limited in number and not widely known. OE's Director of Adult Education hopes that an ongoing special project will provide a sound basis for the kind of diagnostic devices needed.

CONCLUSIONS

The Adult Education program could be more successful if OE gave State and local program officials the information needed to select the instructional approaches and systems for delivering educational services best suited to the needs of their particular programs.

RECOMMENDATION TO HEW

We recommend that the Secretary of HEW direct OE to (1) evaluate the full range of delivery systems and instructional approaches for the program and (2) disseminate results so that State and local program officials would have the information to identify the most appropriate systems and approaches in various environments and circumstances.

AGENCY COMMENTS

HEW agreed with this recommendation and stated that OE will develop criteria to identify quality delivery systems and instructional approaches used in Adult Education programs across the Nation. The delivery systems which meet these criteria will be identified and, through the mechanism of the Adult Education Clearinghouse, disseminated to State and local programs.

CHAPTER 5

SCOPE OF REVIEW

We assessed the progress of the adult basic education program in reaching and educating the target population and evaluated the Adult Education program's management.

At OE headquarters in Washington, D.C., and at HEW regional offices in Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, we interviewed OE officials and reviewed policies, regulations, practices, and procedures for administering the program. We also examined several program reports prepared by consultants. At State and local offices, we interviewed program officials, teachers, and students and examined program records and reports. The programs reviewed were located in California, Illinois, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia.

APPENDIX I

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20201

March 25, 1975

Mr. Gregory J. Ahart
Director, Manpower and Welfare Division
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Mr. Ahart:

The Secretary asked that I respond to your request for our comments on your draft report to the Congress entitled, "Adult Basic Education Program: Results in Reducing Illiteracy and Improvements Needed". They are enclosed.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on this draft report before its publication.

Sincerely yours,

John D. Young
Assistant Secretary, Comptroller

Enclosure

COMMENTS

Comments of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the Comptroller General's Report to the Congress entitled, "Adult Basic Education Program: Results in Reducing Illiteracy and Improvements Needed". B-164031(1), dated January 29, 1975.

One of the requirements for the approval of a State plan will be the incorporation of procedures for accomplishing the objectives recommended in the GAO report. Consequently, the DHEW/OE Operational Planning System for Fiscal Year 1976 will include the objectives identified in the following responses to the GAO recommendations and will provide milestones to measure the effectiveness of the program in accomplishing the requirements set forth in the State plan provisions of the regulations (45 CFR 166) which govern the adult education program. The FY 1976 OPS will also include provisions for the development of more specific guidelines to be issued to the State Educational Agencies for assessing program objectives, identifying outputs, and measuring impacts.

GAO Recommendation

That the Secretary of HEW require OE to establish clear, measurable objectives indicating what the Adult Education Program is intended to accomplish in terms of output or impact and periodic milestones to measure the program's effectiveness in accomplishing these objectives as required by HEW's Operational Planning System. OE should also require that the various State education agencies establish and measure similar objectives.

Department Comment

We concur with this recommendation. The Office of Education will include in its FY 76 Operational Planning System measurable objectives which describe the intended accomplishments of the adult education programs. These objectives will be shared with the States for incorporation into their State plans at the earliest feasible time. Using the State plan mechanism, the Office of Education will require the States to establish similar objectives for the State programs.

Periodic milestones to measure the outputs and impact of the adult education program will be an integral part of the FY 76 Operational Planning System. Priority groups will be specified and emphasis placed on identifying, recruiting and educating those groups. Expenditures will be required to be reported in a format that will allow us to assess whether this emphasis is being implemented and to determine that the 20% secondary level limitation is being observed. Through monitoring and providing technical assistance, the Office of Education will assess and help effectuate program accomplishments.

GAO Recommendation

That the Secretary of HEW require OE to develop a system for identifying potential benefits of special projects and insuring maximum dissemination and adoption of their results to State and local levels of management as a part of OE's authority under the Education Amendments of 1974 to establish an Adult Education Clearinghouse.

Department Comment:

We concur with this recommendation. Under the Clearinghouse on Adult Education, as authorized in the Education Amendments of 1974, the Office of Education will establish a system for identifying potential benefits, insuring dissemination, and fostering adoption of special projects results.

GAO Recommendation

That the Secretary of HEW require OE to develop, in consultation with the States, a method for enhancing cooperation and coordination to eliminate potential duplication among the States in carrying out special projects and teacher training efforts.

Department Comment:

We concur with this recommendation. Regulation § 166.25, which provides for establishing national priorities in adult education, directs the Office of Education to review and identify for the guidance of State educational agencies national priorities annually in the field of adult education.

Through the mechanism of analyzing State plans, areas of possible duplication in carrying out special projects and teacher training will be cited and the information will be fed back to the States involved.

In order to further assist in effectuating this recommendation, the Office of Education will incorporate into its final regulations a request to all States to furnish the Clearinghouse

on Adult Education with a description of proposals for 309 projects which they intend to fund. Through this mechanism, areas of unnecessary duplication and desirable coordination will be identified. Through Regional Offices, technical assistance will be provided in order to minimize unnecessary duplication in the areas of special projects and teacher training. Using the ERIC classification system and descriptors, the Office of Education will publish annually through the Clearinghouse on Adult Education a synopsis of projects funded yearly. This publication will be disseminated to the State educational agencies.

GAO Recommendation

That the Secretary of HEW require OE to enforce the present requirement on State and local programs to coordinate Adult Education Programs with other antipoverty programs and manpower training programs as required by the Adult Education Act, by monitoring State and local programs to insure that such coordination is being accomplished and is effective in providing optimum services.

Department Comment

We concur with this recommendation. The Office of Education will develop guidelines addressing coordination requirements under the regulations. The purpose of these guidelines will be to provide technical assistance to State and local programs in carrying out their responsibilities.

In the final publication of the regulations, the States will be required to include in their annual plans clear and concise procedures, policies, and mechanisms by which the States will insure the coordination of all programs stipulated in the legislation. This coordination will be reflected at both the State and local educational agency levels. The Office of Education will develop and implement a strategy for sampling three States to determine the extent of compliance to the regulatory requirement of coordination.

GAO Recommendation

That the Secretary of HEW require OE to inventory and evaluate the full range of delivery systems and instructional approaches for the program and disseminate

results in order that State and local program officials would have the information necessary for them to identify the system and approach most appropriate under a given set of circumstances.

Department Comment

We concur with this recommendation. The Office of Education will initially develop a set of criteria for identifying quality delivery systems and instructional approaches used in adult education programs across the nation. The delivery systems which meet these criteria will be identified and, through the mechanism of the Adult Education Clearinghouse, disseminated to State and local programs.

GAO Recommendation

That the Secretary of HEW require OE to institute procedures to improve the accuracy and timelines of program statistics derived from local programs and summarized at the State level. The Office of Education should also establish separate reporting on enrollments and completions for non-English-speaking enrollees.

Department Comment

We concur with both parts of this recommendation. The Office of Education will identify those factors which appear to contribute to problems in accuracy and timeliness in reporting, and subsequently develop a program to improve the reporting system. The Office of Education will provide technical assistance to the States to help insure that new strategies to correct problems of inaccuracy and timeliness will be implemented.

The Office of Education will seek approval from the Office of Management and Budget to collect separate data on enrollments and completions for non-English-speaking enrollees on revised statistical reporting forms to be used for FY 76.

APPENDIX II

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE:		
Caspar W. Weinberger	Feb. 1973	Present
Frank C. Carlucci (acting)	Jan. 1973	Feb. 1973
Elliot L. Richardson	June 1970	Jan. 1973
Robert H. Finch	Jan. 1969	June 1970
Wilbur J. Cohen	Mar. 1968	Jan. 1969
John W. Gardner	Aug. 1965	Mar. 1968
ASSISTANT SECRETARY (EDUCATION):		
Virginia Y. Trotter	June 1974	Present
Charles B. Saunders, Jr. (acting)	Nov. 1973	June 1974
Sidney P. Marland, Jr.	Nov. 1972	Nov. 1973
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION:		
Terrel H. Bell	June 1974	Present
John R. Ottina	Aug. 1973	June 1974
John R. Ottina (acting)	Nov. 1972	Aug. 1973
Sidney P. Marland, Jr.	Dec. 1970	Nov. 1972
Terrel H. Bell (acting)	June 1970	Dec. 1970
James E. Allen, Jr.	May 1969	June 1970
Peter P. Muirhead (acting)	Jan. 1969	May 1969
Harold Howe II	Jan. 1966	Jan. 1969